



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/704,569	11/03/2000	Herman Rodriguez	AUS9-2000-0488-US1	2337

40412 7590 08/02/2007
IBM CORPORATION- AUSTIN (JVL)
C/O VAN LEEUWEN & VAN LEEUWEN
PO BOX 90609
AUSTIN, TX 78709-0609

EXAMINER

ROBINSON BOYCE, AKIBA K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3628

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/02/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/704,569
Filing Date: November 03, 2000
Appellant(s): RODRIGUEZ ET AL.

MAILED

AUG 02 2007

GROUP 3600

Leslie A. Van Leeuwen

For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 4/16/07 appealing from the Office action
mailed 12/4/06.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

2002/0111845	CHONG	8-2002
6,553,108	FELGER	4-2003
6,401,085	GERSHMAN ET AL	6-2002
6076121	LEVINE	6-2000

Art Unit: 3628

5,995,939

BERMAN ET AL

11-1999

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 3, 18, 20, 28, 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chong (US 2002/0111845 A1).

As per claims 1, 28, Chong discloses:

Scheduling the travel arrangements using a computer system; recording the scheduled travel arrangements on a nonvolatile storage device connected to the computer system, ([0027], lines 3-5, shows that during the planning of events, schedules of key attendees are accessed off of the company Intranet. In this case, the travel arrangements are represented by the schedules of key attendees, and it is inherent that the arrangements went through scheduling if they are already arranged, and that these arrangements are stored on some type of device since the schedules are stored on the Intranet);

Art Unit: 3628

Sending one or more automated requests corresponding to the travel arrangements from the computer system to one or more service agents, wherein the automated requests are based on a traveler's user profile, (see Pg. 6, 1st Col., step 4, shows the generation of service requests for any vendor is based on entered data, where entered data is shown in [0027], lines 11-24, here, the CMP inputs meeting planning data consisting of personal employee data, such as names, home telephone numbers, etc, and this type of information represents the user's profile),

and wherein at least one of the service agents are selected from the group consisting of a delivery service agent, a telephone system, an electronic calendar system, and a *medical information system*, ([0027], shows medical information and medications are input as meeting planning data, and since service request for any vendor are based on entered data, the vendor [service agent] will deal with medical information).

As per claim 3, 20, 30, Chong discloses:

sending includes one of sending an automatic email message, sending an automatic facsimile, and sending an automatic data stream using a predefined protocol, (Page 6, 1st Col, Step 5, truncated email).

As per claim 18, Chong discloses:

a travel automation tool, the travel automation tool including:

means for scheduling travel arrangements using a computer system; means for recording the scheduled travel arrangements on the nonvolatile storage device, ([0027], lines 3-5, shows that during the planning of events, schedules of key attendees are

Art Unit: 3628

accessed off of the company Intranet. In this case, the travel arrangements are represented by the schedules of key attendees, and it is inherent that the arrangements went through scheduling if they are already arranged, and that these arrangements are stored on some type of device since the schedules are stored on the Intranet); and

means for sending one or more automated requests from the information handling system to one or more service agents, wherein the automated requests are based on a traveler's user profile, (see Pg. 6, 1st Col., step 4, shows the generation of service requests for any vendor is based on entered data, where entered data is shown in [0027], lines 11-24, here, the CMP inputs meeting planning data consisting of personal employee data, such as names, home telephone numbers, etc, and this type of information represents the user's profile);

wherein at least one of the service agents are selected from the group consisting of a delivery service agent, a telephone system, and electronic calendar system, and a medical information system, ([0027], shows medical information and medications are input as meeting planning data, and since service request for any vendor are based on entered data, the vendor [service agent] will deal with medical information).

The following is inherent with Chong:

one or more processors;

a memory accessible by the processors;

a nonvolatile storage device accessible by the processors.

The above hardware is inherent with Chong since Chong shows that a computer is used to process steps of the invention in [0024], therefore one or more processors, a

Art Unit: 3628

memory accessible by the processors, and a nonvolatile storage device accessible by the processors is inherent since computers need processors to successfully process the incoming information, and since computers need memory/storage areas to hold the data to be processed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 25, 35 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chong (US 2002/0111845 A1), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Gershman et al (US 6,401,085).

As per claims 25, 35, 41, Chong does not specifically disclose the following, but does disclose receiving automated requests on Pg. 6, 1st Col., step 4, as described above in preceding paragraphs.

However, Gershman et al discloses:

Receiving the automated request at the electronic calendar system, (Col. 10, lines 62-65, receiving input text in character form indicative of the target meeting, where the input text is generated by a calendar program);

Updating an electronic calendar maintained by the electronic calendar system with information related to the travel arrangements, (Col. 11, lines 15-18, system

Art Unit: 3628

updates the calendaring system, w/ col. 45, lines 48-56, shows the user can select travel when using a calendaring system to manage daily logistics display in accordance with the embodiment of the invention).

Gershman et al discloses this information in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that travel can be implemented in a calendaring system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to receive automated requests at, and to update an electronic calendaring system with the motivation of using a calendaring system to manage travel information.

Claims 4-10, 21-23, 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chong (US 2002/0111845 A1), and further in view of Levine (US 6,076,121), as cited by applicant.

As per claims 4, 21, 31, Chong fails to disclose wherein the delivery service agents include one or more parcel services; and wherein the automated requests include one of holding packages for customer pickup, delivering packages on a future date, and leaving packages with a neighbor, but does disclose an agent that processes a customer's travel requests in the abstract, lines 7-10.

However, Levine discloses:

wherein the delivery service agents include one or more parcel services, and wherein the automated requests include one of holding packages for customer pickup, delivering packages on a future date, and leaving packages with a neighbor, (col. 2, lines 8-14, [mail or parcel system, where holding packages for customer pickup,

Art Unit: 3628

delivering packages on a future date and leaving packages with a neighbor are obvious with the system since the system is directed towards a postal business and these types of requests are common and standard in postal operations]). Levine discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that a parcel service can be incorporated into a delivery service agent system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention for an automated request to include one of holding packages for customer pickup, delivering packages on a future date, and leaving packages with a neighbor with the motivation of getting the package to the owner in a reasonable amount of time.

As per claim 5, Chong fails to disclose wherein the delivery services include a post office, and wherein the automated holding mail for on a future date address requests include at least one of customer pickup, delivering mail and forwarding mail to another, but does disclose a travel service management information system in col. 2, lines 13-17.

However Levine discloses:

wherein the delivery services include a post office, and wherein the automated holding mail for on a future date address requests include at least one of customer pickup, delivering mail and forwarding mail to another, (Col. 2, lines 14-17, [post office and parcel handling offices, where customer pickup, delivering and forwarding mail are obvious with the system since the system is directed towards a postal business and these types of requests are common and standard in postal operations])). Levine

Art Unit: 3628

discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that post office services can be incorporated into a delivery service agent system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention for an automated request to include customer pickup, delivering and forwarding mail with the motivation of getting the package to the owner in a reasonable amount of time.

As per claim 6, Chong fails to disclose wherein the delivery services includes a company mailroom, and wherein the automated requests include at least one of holding mail for future pickup, delivering mail on a future date, and forwarding mail to another address, but does disclose a travel service management information system in col. 2, lines 13-17.

However Levine discloses:

wherein the delivery services includes a company mailroom, and wherein the automated requests include at least one of holding mail for future pickup, delivering mail on a future date, and forwarding mail to another address, (Col. 2, line 28, [shows sorting which occurs in a mailroom, where holding mail for future pickup, delivering mail on a future date and forwarding mail to another address are obvious with the system since the system is directed towards a postal business and these types of requests are common and standard in postal operations. Levine discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that post office services can be incorporated into a delivery service agent system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention for an automated request to include holding mail for future pickup, delivering mail on a future date and forwarding mail to another address with the motivation of getting the package to the owner in a reasonable amount of time.

As per claims 7, 22, 32, Chong fail to disclose wherein the service agents include one or more of the telephone systems and wherein the sending automated requests include configuring instructions corresponding to a telephone, but does disclose a travel service management information system in col. 2, lines 13-17.

However Levine discloses:

wherein the service agents include one or more telephone systems and wherein the sending automated requests include configuring instructions corresponding to a telephone, (Col. 8, lines 45-47, [telephone network], Col. 12, lines 20-35, [assigning FP code represents configuring]). Levine discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that telephone services can be incorporated into a delivery service agent system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to include configuring instructions corresponding to a telephone with the motivation of properly guiding the user for telephone operation.

As per claim 8, Chong fails to disclose wherein the configuring requests include at least one of changing a voicemail greeting, forwarding calls received at a first phone number to a second phone number, transferring a caller to an alternate phone number,

and providing the caller with an emergency contact, but does disclose a travel service management information system in col. 2, lines 13-17.

However Levine discloses:

wherein the configuring requests include at least one of changing a voicemail greeting, forwarding calls received at a first phone number to a second phone number, transferring a caller to an alternate phone number, and providing the caller with an emergency contact, (Col. 22, lines 37-43, [call forwarding]). Levine discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that telephone services can be incorporated into a delivery service agent system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to include call forwarding in the configuring request with the motivation of guaranteeing a successful telephone connection.

As per claims 9, 23, 33, Chong fails to disclose registering the telephone with an email system prior to the configuring, wherein the registering includes sending a message to the email system, but does disclose an email system in col. 3, lines 49-50.

However Levine discloses:

registering the telephone with an email system prior to the configuring, wherein the registering includes sending a message to the email system, (Col. 1, lines 32-40, [voice signals being carried to the Internet server], col.2 , lines 51-61, [shows e-mail message]). Levine discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that telephone and email services can be incorporated into a delivery service agent system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to register the telephone with an email system prior to the configuring with the motivation of guaranteeing another contact means.

As per claim 10, Chong fails to disclose setting a backup contact name, wherein the backup contact name corresponds with an alternate phone number, and receiving a predefined signal from a calling telephone requesting the transferring to the alternate phone number, but does disclose a travel service management information system in col. 2, lines 13-17.

However Levine discloses:

setting a backup contact name, wherein the backup contact name corresponds with the alternate phone number, and receiving a predefined signal from a calling telephone requesting the transferring to the alternate phone number, (col. 22, lines 13-25, [translated pseudo-number connection to a temporary intermediate destination/different destination due to signals]. Levine discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that a signal can be responsible for connections to certain destinations]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to set a backup contact name, wherein the backup contact name corresponds with the alternate phone number, and receive a predefined signal from a calling telephone requesting the transferring to the alternate phone number with the motivation of guaranteeing a telephone connection with an available person.

Claims 14, 15, 27, 37, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chong (US 2002/0111845 A1), and further in view of Berman et al (US 5,995,939).

As per claim 14, Chong fails to disclose receiving the automated request at the medical information system, and downloading destination related medical information to a computing device that is accessible by a user in response to the received request, but does disclose receiving an automated request in col. 7, lines 4-7, where it is shown that a customer request is routed to an agent by a software-assisted routine.

However Berman et al discloses:

receiving the automated request at the medical information system, (Col. 3, lines 64-67, [crate/send service message]);

and downloading destination related medical information to a computing device that is accessible by a user in response to the received request, (Col. 12, lines 24-35, [retrieving e-mail addresses for sponsoring systems]). Berman et al discloses these limitations in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that a medical information system can be incorporated into a travel arrangement system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to receive an automated request and download destination related medical information to a computing device with the motivation of properly delivering medical data to a device that is easily accessible by a user.

As per claim 15, Chong fails to disclose wherein the medical information corresponds with one or more medical services offered at a travel destination, but does disclose completing travel arrangements in col. 7, line 23.

However Berman et al discloses:

wherein the medical information corresponds with one or more medical services offered at a travel destination, (Col. 2, line 26-31, [correspondence between the office and the testing lab]). Berman et al discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that medical information can be incorporated into a travel arrangement system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention for the medical information to correspond with one or more medical service offered at a travel destination with the motivation of providing means for a user to acquire medical treatment in a reasonable amount of time.

As per claims 27, 37, Chong discloses:

means for receiving/receiving the automated request at a second information handling system, ([0016], second node).

means for searching/searching a database connected to the second information handling system for requested information, ([0006] database).

means for downloading/downloading...information resulting from the searching to a computing device that is accessible by a user, ([0035], final information can be downloaded).

Chong does not disclose that the downloaded information is destination related medical information, however, does disclose downloading information as described above.

However, Berman et al disclose:

Downloading destination related medical information, (Col. 12, lines 24-35, retrieving e-mail addresses for sponsoring systems represents downloading of information, w/ Col. 2, line 26-31, where medical information is shown to be the correspondence between the office and the testing lab. Berman et al discloses these limitations in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that a medical information system can be incorporated into a travel arrangement system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to receive an automated request and download destination related medical information to a computing device with the motivation of properly delivering medical data to a device that is easily accessible by a user.

Claims 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chong (US 2002/0111845 A1), and further in view of Felger (6,553,108).

As per claims 38-40, Chong fails to disclose wherein one of the automated requests results in increasing an user's electronic wallet balance and decreasing a user's bank account balance, the user corresponding to the travel arrangements, but does disclose completing travel arrangements in col. 7, line 23.

However, Felger discloses:

Art Unit: 3628

wherein one of the automated requests results in increasing an user's electronic wallet balance and decreasing a user's bank account balance, the user corresponding to the travel arrangements, (Abstract, lines 1-32, [request received from user and information associated with a credit account requested, and charging the user's credit account, w/ Col. 13, lines 61-66, [where the credit account is shown to be an e-wallet to pay a fee. In this case, since the credit account is shown to be an e-wallet, it is obvious that when a fee is presented, the user's bank account, which is associated with the e-wallet is decreased, therefore causing an increase of the same amount in the e-wallet account])). Felger discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that electronic wallets are used to pay fees for value added services.

It would have been obvious tone of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant' s invention for one of the automated requests to result in increasing an user's electronic wallet balance and decreasing a user's bank account balance, the user corresponding to the travel arrangements with the motivation of showing that electronic wallets can be used in handling travel arrangements.

(10) Response to Argument

As per claim 1, appellant argues that Chong fails to teach "sending one or more automated requests corresponding to the travel arrangements from the computer system to one or more service agents, wherein the automated requests are based on a traveler's user profile, and wherein at least one of the service agents are selected from the group consisting of a delivery service agent, a telephone system, an electronic calendar system, and a medical information system." Appellant argues that Chong

Art Unit: 3628

does not disclose all of the limitations since the cited section does not teach that the automated service requests correspond to travel arrangements, are sent from the computer system to one or more service agents, and are based on the user's travel profile. However, Chong discloses that the generation of service requests for any vendor is based on entered data on Pg. 6, 1st Col., step 4, where entered data is shown in [0027], lines 11-24, here, the CMP inputs meeting planning data consisting of personal employee data, such as names, home telephone numbers, etc, and this type of information represents the user's profile. This type of information corresponds to travel arrangements since this passage shows that meeting planning data includes travel cost data, hotel, etc. In addition, the service requests are sent from the computer system to one or more service agents since it is taught that service requests are sent to any vendor on Pg. 6, 1st Col., step 4. In this case, the vendor represents the service agent. Finally, the automated requests are based on the user's profile since as described above, [0027], lines 11-24, it is taught that the CMP inputs meeting planning data consisting of personal employee data, such as names, home telephone numbers, etc, and this type of information represents the user's profile.

Claims 18 and 28 disclose similar limitations to those of claim 1 and are therefore rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 3 depends from 1, claim 20 depends from claim 18, and claim 30 depends from claim 28, and are also still rejected for the same reasons.

As per claims 25, 35, and 41, these claims depend from independent claims 18, 28 and 1 respectively, and are rejected for at least the reasons discussed above with

regard to independent claims 1, 18, and 28. In addition, appellant argues that Gershman does not disclose "receiving the automated request at the electronic calendar system" and then "updating an electronic calendar maintained by the electronic calendar system with information related to the travel arrangements", and that Gershman does not appear to have anything to do with receiving an automated request at an electronic calendar system. However, Gershman deals with a calendaring system that helps individuals prepare a meeting as shown in Col. 10, line 58-Col. 11, line 21. It is shown that the calendar arrangements are updated in Col. 11, lines 15-18, where the system updates the calendaring system.

In addition, with respect to claims 4-10, 21-23, and 31-33, this pre-KSR brief argues that there is no motivation to combine Chong and Levine. KSR forecloses Appellant's argument that a specific teaching is required for a finding of obviousness. *KSR*, 127 S.Ct. at 1741, 82 USPQ2d at 1396. Claims 4-10, 21-23, and 31-33 recited combinations which only unite old elements with no change in their respective functions and which yield predictable results. Thus, the claimed subject matter likely would have been obvious under *KSR*.

Also, as per claims 4-10, 21-23, and 31-33, these claims depend, either directly or ultimately, from one of the independent claims, and are therefore still rejected for the same reasons.

Appellant argues that prior art does not teach the following: "wherein the delivery service agent includes one or more parcel services...holding packages for customer pickup, delivering packages on a future date, and leaving packages with a neighbor" as

disclosed in claim 4, or "wherein the delivery service agent includes a post office, and wherein the automated requests include at least one of holding mail for customer pickup, delivering mail on a future date, and forwarding mail to another address, as disclosed in claim 5, "wherein the delivery service agent includes a company mailroom, and wherein the automated requests include at least one of holding mail for future pickup, delivering mail on a future date, and forwarding mail to another address" as shown in claim 6, or "wherein the automated requests include at least one of holding packages for future pickup, delivering packages on a future date, and leaving packages at an alternate location" as disclosed in claims 21 and 31. However, as already disclosed in the rejection, holding packages for customer pickup, delivering packages on a future date and leaving packages with a neighbor are obvious with Levine since the system is directed towards a postal business (which can be represented by a post office or a postal mailroom) and these types of requests are common and standard in postal operations.

As per claim 7, appellant argues that prior art does not teach "wherein sending automated requests include configuring instructions corresponding to a telephone." However, Col. 8, lines 45-47 of Levine discloses a telephone network, and Col. 12, lines 20-35 of Levine discloses assigning FP codes, which represents configuring. Appellant argues that Levine is not concerned with configuring the telephone itself, but, rather, with assigning a functional property code to the telephone (or other device), so that the FP code can be used at a later point in time to route items between points within the network. As further claimed by Appellants in claims 8-10, 23, and 33, the configuring

may include registering the telephone with an e-mail system, changing a voicemail greeting, etc, and appellant argues that there is nothing in Levine that discloses this type of configuring. However, in order to register a telephone with an e-mail system, would it not be helpful to configure the telephone so items can be routed between points within the network since this is how e-mail functions? By introducing the FP code, a user has the ability to configure the telephone to be incorporated into data transmission services such as e-mail, and therefore the FP code represents the configuring instruction of the present invention.

As per claims 14, 15, 27 and 37, this pre-KSR brief argues that there is no motivation to combine Chong and Berman. KSR forecloses Appellant's argument that a specific teaching is required for a finding of obviousness. *KSR*, 127 S.Ct. at 1741, 82 USPQ2d at 1396. Claims 14, 15, 27 and 37 recited combinations which only unite old elements with no change in their respective functions and which yield predictable results. Thus, the claimed subject matter likely would have been obvious under *KSR*.

In addition, as per claims 14, 15, 27 and 37, these claims depend from claims 1, 14, 18 and 28 respectively, and are therefore rejected for the same reasons as disclosed with respect to claims 1, 14, 18 and 28. Specifically, as per claim 14, appellant makes similar arguments to those of claim 1, and claim 14 is therefore rejected for the same reason as claim 1. Also, appellants argue that Berman's claim 17 does not have anything to do with downloading destination related medical information in response to receiving a travel related automated request. However, the new combination of Chong, and Berman disclose this limitation. As disclosed above in the

rejection, Chong discloses the automated requests for travel-related information.

Berman is an automated networked service request and fulfillment system and method introduced to show the medical information system aspect. Specifically, in Col. 12, lines 24-35, Berman recites retrieving e-mail addresses for sponsoring systems in a medical environment. In this case, the e-mail addresses correspond to the destination to which the information will be sent.

As per claims 27 and 37, appellant makes similar arguments to those of claims 1 and 17, and claims 27 and 37 are therefore rejected for the same reason as claims 1 and 17.

As per claims 38-40, this pre-KSR brief argues that there is no motivation to combine Chong and Felger. KSR forecloses Appellant's argument that a specific teaching is required for a finding of obviousness. *KSR*, 127 S.Ct. at 1741, 82 USPQ2d at 1396. Claims 38-40 recited combinations which only unite old elements with no change in their respective functions and which yield predictable results. Thus, the claimed subject matter likely would have been obvious under *KSR*.

Also, as per claims 38-40, these claims depend from claims 1, 18 and 28 respectively, and are therefore rejected for the same reasons as disclosed with respect to claims 1, 18 and 28. In addition, appellant argues that prior art does not teach or suggest a travel-related automatic request increases a user's electronic wallet balance and decreases a user's bank account balance. However, the *combination* of Chong and Felger discloses this limitation. As already discussed, Chong discloses the travel-related automated requests. In addition, in the abstract, lines 1-32, of Felger, a request

Art Unit: 3628

is received from the user, information associated with a credit account requested, and the user's credit account is charged. In addition, in Col. 13, lines 61-66, the credit account is shown to be an e-wallet to pay a fee. In this case, since the credit account is shown to be an e-wallet, it is obvious that when a fee is presented, the user's bank account, which is associated with the e-wallet is decreased, therefore causing an increase of the same amount in the e-wallet account. Since the credit account is charged due the user request, this means that the users accounts will be increased/decreased accordingly.


(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.


Respectfully submitted,

Akiba Robinson-Boyce



Conferees:

John Hayes



Vincent Millin

